

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please replace FIG. 1, FIG. 5, and FIG. 6 with the attached replacement sheets.

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **12 February 2008**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-36. Examiner objected to the abstract. Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). Examiner rejected to claims 25-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Examiner rejected claims 25-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4, 10-12, 13-14, 16, 22-24, 25-26, 28, and 34-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Kenny (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0007210 hereinafter “Kenny”). Examiner rejected claims 5-9, 17-21, and 29-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Kenny, and Haran et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0249498 hereinafter “Haran”). Examiner objected to claims 3 and 15 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten.

Objections to the Specification

Examiner objected to the abstract, the summary, and paragraphs [0027], [0028], and [0052].

Applicant has revised the abstract according to examiner’s suggestions. Applicant has also amended the first paragraph of the summary, paragraph [0012], to better summarize embodiments of the invention. Note that the summary section is not required by the MPEP.

Applicant has also amended paragraphs [0001], [0027], [0028], and [0052] to correct the typographical errors. No new matter has been added.

Objections to the Drawings

Examiner objected to FIG. 1, FIG. 5, and FIG. 6. Applicant has amended these figures per examiner’s suggestion. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Examiner rejected to claims 25-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Applicant has amended paragraph [0040] in the specification to remove the language directed to carrier waves. Furthermore, applicant has amended claims 25-36 so that these claims are directed to storage **devices**, which does not include carrier waves. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Examiner rejected claims 25-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Applicant wishes to point out that claims 25-36, although directed to storage devices, encompass the method and operation covered in method claims 1-12, the subject matter of which is well enabled by the specification. Paragraph [0040] of the instant application explicitly states that the operations described in the specification can be implemented in computer code stored in storage media. Hence, the specification meets the enablement requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 112 with respect to claims 25-36. A withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Examiner indicated that claims 3 and 15 are allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant has rewritten claims 3, 15, and 25 in independent forms which include all the limitations of the base claim and the intervening claim. Note that claim 27 corresponds to claims 3 and 15. Claims 2, 3, 14, 15, 26, and 27 are cancelled without prejudice. Applicant has also amended claims 4, 16, and 28 to reflect the correct claim dependency. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 13, and 25 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 4-12, which depend upon claim 1, claims 16-24, which depend upon

claim 13, and claims 28-36, which depend upon claim 25, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the application is presently in form for allowance.
Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Shun Yao/
Shun Yao
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 16 June 2008

Shun Yao
Park, Vaughan & Fleming LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com